

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 7 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated May 16, 2006

### Remarks

#### I. Status of claims

Claims 1-5, 14-18, and 29-33 were pending.

Claims 34-37 have been added.

#### II. Interview summary record

On June 29, 2006, the Examiner and Edouard Garcia discussed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, that was issued in the Office action dated May 16, 2006. No agreement was reached regarding the propriety of this rejection.

During this conversation, the Examiner indicated that the original subject matter of previously canceled claims 6, 11, and 12 could be reintroduced into the application by an amendment that was filed with a request for continued examination. The Examiner suggested that the subject matter of claim 1 in combination with the subject matter recited in one or more of the original claims 6, 11, and 12 might place claim 1 in condition for allowance.

In response to this invitation, independent claims 1, 14, and 29 have been amended to incorporate the pertinent features of claim 6 as originally filed.

New claims 34 and 36 contain subject matter that corresponds to the subject matter of original claim 11 and new claims 35 and 37 contain subject matter that corresponds to the subject matter of original claim 12.

#### III. Objection to the specification and claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has objected to the specification because the "limitations 'human-readable' and 'intrinsic human intelligible meaning' are not defined in the specification."

The Examiner also has rejected claims 1-5, 14-18, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner has stated that:

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 8 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated May 16, 2006

The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitations "human-readable" and "intrinsic human intelligible meaning" are not described in the specification.

The terms "human-readable" and "intrinsic human intelligible meaning" have been deleted from the claims. For this reason, both the objection to the specification and the rejection of claims 1-5, 14-18, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

### III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 14-18, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Fields (U.S. 6,704,797).

#### A. Independent claim 1

Fields discloses a sever for distributing images in accordance with a server-based policy defined by one or more rules for selectively distributing different versions of an original image. When a client request for an image is received, the server evaluates a rule against client-specific data in the request. If the client-specific data satisfies a condition of the rule, a specified restriction is imposed on the distribution of the image.

The client requests that are received by Fields' server do not contain image components. Moreover, Fields does not teach that his server includes a character recognizer that is configured to translate characters in image components of electronic messages into computer-readable character representations. Fields also does not teach that his server is configured to detect access restriction notices in electronic messages by comparing one or more translated computer-readable character representations respectively produced by a character recognizer to respective representations of one or more access restriction notices stored in memory.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Fields now should be withdrawn.

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 9 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated May 16, 2006

B. Dependent claims 2-5, 30, and 33

Each of claims 2-5, 30, and 33 incorporates the features of independent claim 1 and therefore is patentable over Fields for at least the same reasons explained above.

C. Independent claim 14

Independent claim 14 recites features that essentially track the pertinent features of independent claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, claim 14 is patentable over Fields for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with independent claim 1.

D. Dependent claims 15-18 and 31

Each of claims 15-18 and 31 incorporates the features of independent claim 14 and therefore is patentable over Fields for at least the same reasons explained above.

E. Independent claim 29

Independent claim 29 recites features that essentially track the pertinent features of independent claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, claim 29 is patentable over Fields for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with independent claim 1.

F. Dependent claim 32

Claim 32 incorporates the features of independent claim 29 and therefore is patentable over Fields for at least the same reasons explained above.

Applicant : William J. Beyda  
Serial No. : 09/668,039  
Filed : September 21, 2000  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 00P7906US  
Reply to Office action dated May 16, 2006


IV. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 13 July 06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David D. Chung  
Reg. No. 38,409

Please direct all correspondence to:

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department  
Telephone: (732) 321-3026